arXiv:1611.01944v2 [math.OC] 8 Nov 2016

Optimal Drift Rate Control and Impulse Control for a Stochastic Inventory/Production System

Ping Cao* and Dacheng Yao†

November 9, 2016

Abstract

We prove that a $\{(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star), \{\mu^\star(x) : x \in [0, S^\star]\}\}$ policy is an optimal joint drift rate control and impulse control for a stochastic inventory system under long-run average cost criterion, where the impulse control follows the $(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star)$ policy, that brings the inventory level up to $q^\star$ once it drops to 0 and brings it down to $Q^\star$ once it rises to $S^\star$, and the drift rate only depends on the current inventory level and follows the function $\mu^\star(x)$ for the inventory level $x \in [0, S^\star]$. Furthermore, we find that the optimal drift rate $\mu^\star(x)$ is firstly increasing and then decreasing as x increases from 0 to $S^\star$ with a turnover point between $Q^\star$ and $S^\star$. The optimality of $\{(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star), \{\mu^\star(x) : x \in [0, S^\star]\}\}$ policy is proven by using the lower bound approach, and the existence of the optimal policy parameters is shown by solving a free boundary problem.

Keywords: drift rate control; impulse control; Brownian motion; inventory control
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 90B05, 93E20, 60J70,49N25, 49K15

1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with joint drift rate control and impulse control problem related to optimally adjust the supply/production rate and inventory level of an inventory/production system. The *netput* inventory level process, capturing the difference of regular supply/production process and the demand process, has the following representation

$$W_t = x_0 + \int_0^t \mu_s \, \mathrm{d}s + \sigma B_t, \quad t \geq 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $W_0 = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the initial inventory level, μ_t is the drift rate at time t and is a decision variable, $\sigma^2 > 0$ is the variance, and $B = \{B_t : t \geq 0\}$ is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion with $B_0 = 0$. The system manager can modify the drift rate at any time, and can also increase and decrease the inventory level at any time by any amount desired. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \{\mu_t \in \mathbb{R} : t \geq 0\}$ denote the drift rate control process, and let $\boldsymbol{Y} = (Y^1, Y^2)$ be a pair of impulse control processes, where $Y^i = (\tau_1^i, \xi_1^i; \tau_2^i, \xi_2^i; \cdots; \tau_n^i, \xi_n^i; \cdots)$, $i = 1, 2$, with that τ_n^1 (τ_n^2) represents the nth

*School of Management, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, China. pcao@ustc.edu.cn
†Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100190, China. dachengyao@amss.ac.cn

time to increase (decrease) the inventory level, and ξ_n^1 (ξ_n^2) denotes the corresponding increment (decrement). Under drift rate control $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and impulse control $\boldsymbol{Y}$, the inventory level evolves according to

$$X_t = x_0 + \int_0^t \mu_s \,\mathrm{d}s + \sigma B_t + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^1} \xi_n^1 - \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^2} \xi_n^2, \quad t \geq 0, \tag{1.2}$$

where $N_t^i = \sup\{n : \tau_n^i \leq t\}$ denotes the number of adjustment of Y^i up to time t. We assume that the inventory level must be nonnegative, i.e. $X_t \geq 0$ for $t \geq 0$. There are three types of cost: the inventory holding cost, the drift rate control cost, and the impulse control cost. Specifically, the holding cost is continuously charged at rate $h(x)$ if the inventory level is x; the drift rate control cost is continuously charged at rate $c(\mu)$ if the drift rate is μ; and the impulse control cost is measured by the amount of adjustment, and cost $K + k\xi$ is incurred when ξ items are increased while cost $L + \ell\xi$ is incurred when ξ items are decreased, where K, k, L and ℓ are strictly positive. The system manager's objective is to find a control policy $\phi = (\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{Y})$, consisting of a drift rate control $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and an impulse control $\boldsymbol{Y}$, to minimize the long-run average expected holding cost, drift rate control cost, and impulse control cost over an infinite planning horizon.

In this paper, we assume that the drift rate of the inventory level process can be controlled but the variance is a constant. There are two reasons for this assumption: First, because of the technical difficulties for the continuous adjustment when the variance is effected by the control, it is a common assumption in literature, see e.g., [2, 3, 15, 21, 22]. Second, this assumption is reasonable for many situations in practice, for example to model branded products (e.g., Intel's processors) that exhibit substantial customer demand; see e.g., [18].

An application of the joint drift rate control and impulse control model is the joint pricing and inventory control problem, in which the demand drift depends on the price, i.e. the inventory level without inventory control follows

$$W_t = x_0 + \int_0^t \mu(p_s) \,\mathrm{d}s + \sigma B_t, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $-\mu(\cdot)$ is the demand rate and it depends on the unit product price p_t at time t. In this kind of problems, the system manager controls the drift rate by adjusting the offered price, while the impulse control corresponds to ordering or returning products. Some special joint pricing and inventory control problems with Brownian motion demand have been studied by few papers; see e.g., [7, 29, 30]. These three papers only allow increasing inventory. Chen et al. [7] consider a joint pricing and inventory control problem, in which the state space of the inventory level is equally divided into finite intervals and in each interval, the price is kept constant. Zhang and Zhang [30] study a problem whose drift rate has a special form. Recently, Yao [29] consider a general model but without proving the existence of optimal policy parameters.

Drift rate control has been studied in literature in different problems, e.g., [2, 3, 8, 13, 15, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28]. Among these works, the two-modes (or two-regimes) models with positive switching costs are widely studied; see [3, 13, 23, 27, 28]. Rath [23] studies an expected average cost problem with linear holding cost function; Doshi [13] considers a discounted cost problem with quadratic holding cost function; Avram and Karaesmen [3] study an expected average profit problem with general reward function; and Wu and Chao [28] study an expected average cost problem with

general holding cost function. These four papers all consider the simple Brownian motion process and prove the optimality of an (m, M) policy, under which it is optimal to use the lower drift rate mode once the system level reaches or is above M, to use the higher drift rate mode once the system level drops to or blow m, and to keep the drift rate mode unchanged otherwise. Vate and Pham [27] study an investment problem under discounted cost criterion, and show that the optimal switching policy is more complicated when the process is geometric Brownian motion.

Furthermore, finite drift rate modes (more than two) are considered in [8, 21, 22, 26]. Specifically, a Brownian control problem with k drift rate modes and positive switching cost is considered by Chernoff and Petkau [8], who provide the optimality conditions for the optimal policies under expected average cost criterion. Recently, Ormeci and Vande Vate [21] consider a Brownian control problem, in which the drift rate can be chosen from a finite set and a positive changeover cost is incurred when the system shifts the drift rate. Using a linear programming (LP) approach, they demonstrate that an optimal solution for their long-run average cost model can be found among a special class of policies called deterministic nonoverlapping control band policies. Further, Ormeci et al. [22] use a new LP approach to deal with the same problem as in Ormeci and Vande Vate [21] and obtain a strong duality theory for the problem. Song et al. [26] consider a general diffusion process problem from utility maximization of an indivisible market, and prove the value function can be characterized as the unique viscosity solution of a quasi-variational inequality (QVI).

Recently, the models in which the drift rate can take any value begin to be paid close attention to; see e.g., [2, 15]. Ata et al. [2] consider a drift rate control problem when the diffusion process is limited in a nonnegative certain interval $[0, b]$ to avoid the system level too low or too high. They prove the existence of the optimal drift rate process, which is independent of the time but only depend on the system level at certain time. Further, Ghosh and Weerasinghe [15] consider the boundary point b also as a decision variable and study a joint drift rate control and queue length control problem without fixed cost for the queue modification. The queueing length control actually is a singular control because of the lack of fixed cost for each modification, and then the problem in [15] is a joint drift rate control and singular control problem. Because of the complication, they provide the optimality conditions for the case of general drift rate cost function and explicitly solve it only under a quadratic control cost structure.

Now a natural question is what will the optimal control policy become if each modification (increasing or decreasing) for the inventory level incurs a fixed cost. Due to the fixed cost, it would be an impulse control for the inventory control. As far as we know, the joint drift control and impulse control for a diffusion process is not studied yet, and in this paper, we consider it using inventory terminology and prove the existence of optimal policy parameters under very general cost structure. Specifically, we prove that a $\{(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star), \{\mu^\star(x) : x \in [0, S^\star]\}\}$ policy is optimal, where $(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star)$ is a control band policy for inventory control and $\mu^\star(x)$ is the optimal drift rate for inventory level $x \in [0, S^\star]$. Under control band policy $(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star)$, the inventory level is immediately increased to level $q^\star$ once it drops to 0 and is decreased to level $Q^\star$ once it goes up to $S^\star$. Furthermore, we find that our optimal drift rate $\mu^\star(x)$ is first decreasing and then increasing in the inventory level $x \in [0, S^\star]$, which is different to the monotone decreasing behavior in [2, 15].

Two-sided impulse control (i.e., increasing and decreasing) problems with constant drift rate have been widely studied in literature, starting from Constantinides [9], Richard [24] and Constantinides and Richard [10]. Constantinides [9] considers a two-sided impulse control problem

with piecewise linear holding and shortage cost rate function under long-run average cost criterion. Assumed feasible policy to be a form of (d, D, U, u) policy, under which the inventory level is immediately increased to level D once the inventory level drops to d and is decreased to level U once the inventory level goes up to u, the optimal policy parameters are explicitly evaluated. Richard [24] considers a two-sided impulse control problem with general holding and shortage cost rate function under discounted cost criterion, and provides some sufficient conditions, well known as verification theorem, for determining the optimal control. Further, Constantinides and Richard [10] prove the optimality of a control band policy (d, D, U, u) for a two-sided impulse control problem with piecewise linear holding and shortage cost rate function under discounted cost criterion. Later, Harrison et al. [16] and Ormeci et al. [20] use the lower bound approach to prove the optimality of a control band policy (d, D, U, u) for the inventory control problem with inventory level constraints and piecewise linear holding and shortage cost rate function under discounted cost criterion and average cost criterion, respectively. Recently, Dai and Yao [11, 12] extend Harrison et al. [16] and Ormeci et al. [20] to the general holding and shortage cost rate function, and prove the optimality of some control band policies. Furthermore, Feng and Muthuraman [14] provide a numerical algorithm to compute the optimal control band policy under the discounted cost criterion. The methods for proving the optimality of selected control band policies in [9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 20] are to obtain the explicit solutions for relative optimality equations. However, for our problem, it is difficult to obtain the explicit solution of relative optimality equation due to the changeable drift rate. To overcome this difficulty, we prove the existence of optimal control policy by analyzing the optimality equation and associated boundary conditions directly.

Finally, our contribution can be summarized as follows. First, to the best of our knowledge, we first study a stochastic inventory problem with joint drift rate control and impulse control, and characterize its optimal control policy. Second, we prove the existence of optimal policy parameters by solving a free boundary problem. This is our major contributions in technique of this paper. Indeed, proving the existence of optimal policy parameters for Brownian control problems is usually important and difficult, and also as the major technical contribution in many literature; see e.g., [4, 5, 11, 12, 14]. Third, unlike simple monotonicity of optimal drift rate in literature (see e.g., [2, 15]), we find that our optimal drift rate function $\mu^\star(x)$ as a function of inventory level x, is first increasing and then decreasing as the inventory level x increases in $[0, S^\star]$.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the mathematical formulation of our joint drift rate control and impulse control problem in Section 2.1, and state our main results in 2.2. In Section 3, we prove the existence of a proposed control policy, which is proven to be optimal in Section 4 using the lower bound approach. Finally, we conclude our paper in Section 5. We close this section with some frequently used notations. Let $x^+ = \max\{0, x\}$, $\mathbb{R}^+ = [0, \infty)$ and $\mathscr{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$ be the space of continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}^+$ that have continuous first derivatives.

2 Formulation and main results

2.1 Model formulation

Let $(\Omega, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space and Brownian motion $B = \{B_t : t \geq 0\}$ is adapted with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$.

Consider an inventory system with *netput* inventory level process given by (1.1). There are two controls for this system: drift rate control $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \{\mu_t : t \geq 0\}$ and impulse control $\boldsymbol{Y} = (Y^1, Y^2)$ with $Y^i = (\tau_1^i, \xi_1^i; \tau_2^i, \xi_2^i; \cdots; \tau_n^i, \xi_n^i; \cdots)$, $i = 1, 2$. A drift rate control $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is *admissible* if μ_t is $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable and μ_t must be in a compact set $\mathcal{U}$ with the smallest element $\underline{\mu}$ and the largest element $\bar{\mu}$. Notice that $\mathcal{U}$ might be a discrete point set or an interval and no further constraints are imposed on $\underline{\mu}$ and $\bar{\mu}$. An impulse control $\boldsymbol{Y}$ is *admissible* if τ_n^i is a stopping time and ξ_n^i is $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n^i}$-measurable. A policy $\phi = (\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{Y})$ is *admissible* if both $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}$ are admissible. Let Π denote the set of all admissible policies. Under an admissible policy ϕ, the controlled inventory level process X should be nonnegative and is given by (1.2).

Under any admissible policy $\phi = (\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{Y})$, the total holding cost in $[0, t]$ would be

$$\int_0^t h(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}s,$$

the total drift rate cost in $[0, t]$ is given by

$$\int_0^t c(\mu_s)\,\mathrm{d}s,$$

and the total inventory control cost in $[0, t]$ is

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N_t^1} \big(K + k\xi_n^1\big) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^2} \big(L + \ell\xi_n^2\big),$$

where $N_t^1 = \sup\{n : \tau_n^1 \leq t\}$ ($N_t^2 = \sup\{n : \tau_n^2 \leq t\}$) is the total number of inventory increasing (decreasing) up to time t. Here, we assume that K, k, L and ℓ are all positive numbers. Therefore, under an admissible policy $\phi = (\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{Y})$, the total long-run average cost is

$$\mathcal{C}(x_0, \phi) = \limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t}\mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^t \big(h(X_s) + c(\mu_s)\big)\,ds + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^1} \big(K + k\xi_n^1\big) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^2} \big(L + \ell\xi_n^2\big)\right],$$

where x_0 is the initial inventory level and we use $\mathbb{E}_x[\cdot]$ to denote $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|X_{0-} = x]$ hereafter. Our objective is to find an admissible policy $\phi^\star = (\boldsymbol{\mu}^\star, \boldsymbol{Y}^\star)$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\mathcal{C}(x_0, \phi^\star) = \inf_{\phi\in\Pi} \mathcal{C}(x_0, \phi).$$

Under mild conditions, it suffices to consider Markov control for an adapted control problem; see e.g., Theorem 11.2.3 in [19]. Thus, in this paper, we only consider the Markov drift rate control, i.e. the drift rate μ_t only depend on the inventory level X_t at time t, and then we rewrite μ_t as $\mu(X_t)$ hereafter.

To the end, we give the following assumptions for the holding cost function h, which are quite standard and are satisfied in most applications of practical interest.

Assumption 1. $h(x)$ is strictly increasing and continuous in x with $x \geq 0$ and $h(0) = 0$. Moreover, $\lim_{x\to\infty} h(x) = \infty$.

2.2 Main results

In this section, we state our main results. In Theorem 2.2, we will show that if the holding cost function satisfies Assumption 1, a policy

$$\phi^\star = \{(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star), \{\mu^\star(x) : x \in [0, S^\star]\}\}$$

is optimal for our joint drift rate control and impulse control problem introduced in Section 2.1, where $(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star)$ with $0 < q^\star < Q^\star < S^\star$ denotes an impulse control policy and $\{\mu^\star(x) : x \in [0, S^\star]\}$ denotes a drift rate control policy. Under $(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star)$ policy, called *control band policy* in literature (see e.g., [16, 20]), the inventory level is increased up to level $q^\star$ instantaneously once it hits 0 and is decreased down to $Q^\star$ instantaneously once it hits $S^\star$. Under $\{\mu^\star(x) : x \in [0, S^\star]\}$ policy, drift rate $\mu^\star(x)$ is chosen when the inventory level is $x \in [0, S^\star]$, where $\mu^\star : [0, S^\star] \to \mathcal{U}$ is defined in (2.7). Furthermore, we find that $\mu^\star(x)$ is decreasing in $x \in [0, x^\star]$ and increasing in $x \in [x^\star, S^\star]$ with $x^\star \in (Q^\star, S^\star)$ defined below (2.5). Before presenting our main results, we first show the existence of optimal policy parameters in the following Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that $h(\cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 1. Then, there exist four parameters $q^\star$, $Q^\star$, $S^\star$ and $\gamma^\star$ with $0 < q^\star < Q^\star < S^\star$ and $\gamma^\star > 0$, and a continuously differentiable function $w^\star(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying*

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}w^\star(x)}{\mathrm{d}x} + \min_{\mu\in\mathcal{U}}\big(\mu w^\star(x) + c(\mu)\big) + h(x) = \gamma^\star, \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^+ \tag{2.1}$$

with boundary conditions

$$\int_0^{q^\star} \big[w^\star(x) + k\big]\,\mathrm{d}x = -K, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\int_{Q^\star}^{S^\star} \big[w^\star(x) - \ell\big]\,\mathrm{d}x = L. \tag{2.3}$$

$$w^\star(q^\star) = -k, \tag{2.4}$$

$$w^\star(Q^\star) = w(S^\star) = \ell. \tag{2.5}$$

Furthermore, there exists a number $x^\star$ with $x^\star \in (Q^\star, S^\star)$ such that $w^\star(x)$ is strictly increasing in $x \in [0, x^\star)$, and strictly decreasing in $x \in (x^\star, \infty)$.

Remark 2.1. *In this paper, we say that a function $g(x)$ is strictly increasing (decreasing) in x, which doesn't mean $g'(x) > 0$ ($g'(x) < 0$) because there may exist an x such that $g'(x) = 0$.*

We next define the optimal drift rate function $\mu^\star$ using Theorem 2.1. For $w \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\pi(w) = \min_{\mu\in\mathcal{U}}\big(\mu w + c(\mu)\big) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(w) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mu\in\mathcal{U}}\big(\mu w + c(\mu)\big), \tag{2.6}$$

where we choose $\mu(w)$ to be the smallest one if there are multiple minimizers. Let

$$\mu^\star(x) = \mu(w^\star(x)) \tag{2.7}$$

denote the optimal drift rate function. Thus, under Theorem 2.1 and (2.7), $\phi^\star = \{(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star), \{\mu^\star(x) : x \in [0, S^\star]\}\}$ policy is well defined and we are ready to present our main results as follows.

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that $h(\cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 1. The policy $\phi^\star$ with parameters given by Theorem 2.1 and (2.7) is an optimal policy among all admissible policies, and $\gamma^\star$ is the optimal long-run average cost. Moreover, $\mu^\star(x)$ is decreasing in $x \in [0, x^\star]$ and is increasing in $x \in [x^\star, S^\star]$.*

Finally, we give a heuristic argument to explain why the optimal policy parameters should satisfy the ordinary differential equation (ODE) (2.1) with boundary conditions (2.2)-(2.5). For given policy $\phi = \{(0, q, Q, S), \{\mu(x) : x \in [0, S]\}\}$, let $V(x)$ be the difference of the expected cumulative cost from state $x \in [0, S]$ to state 0 and the cost $\gamma\tau(x, 0)$, where γ denotes the average cost under policy ϕ and $\tau(x, 0)$ is the first time when the inventory level hits 0 starting from x, i.e., $V(x)$ is the relative value function. If $\phi = \{(0, q, Q, S), \{\mu(x) : x \in [0, S]\}\}$ is optimal, by the principle of optimality, for $X_0 = x \in (0, S)$ and a small time interval with length δ, $V(x)$ should satisfy

$$V(x) = \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{E}_x \Big[\int_0^\delta \big(h(X_s) + c(u_s)\big)\, \mathrm{d}s - \gamma\delta + V(X_\delta) | X_0 = x, \mu_0 = \mu \Big] + o(\delta)$$

with $X_s = x + \mu s + \sigma B_s$ for $s \in [0, \delta]$. It follows from the Itô formula that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_x \Big[\int_0^\delta \big(h(X_s) + c(u_s)\big)\, \mathrm{d}s - \gamma\delta + V(X_\delta) | X_0 = x, \mu_0 = \mu \Big] \\ &\quad = V(x) + \Big[\frac{\sigma^2}{2} V''(x) + \mu V'(x) + h(x) + c(\mu) - \gamma \Big] \delta + o(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by eliminating $V(x)$ and dividing δ on the both sides, and then letting $\delta \to 0$ we know that $V(x)$ satisfies

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{2} V''(x) + \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{U}} \big(\mu V'(x) + c(\mu)\big) + h(x) - \gamma = 0.$$

Let $w^\star(x) = V'(x)$, we obtain (2.1). Furthermore, V should satisfy $V(0) = V(q) + K + kq$ and $V(S) = V(Q) + L + \ell(S - Q)$, which yield (2.2) and (2.3). Besides, for $x \geq S$, under the policy $\phi = \{(0, q, Q, S), \{\mu(x) : x \in [0, S]\}\}$, we must have $V(x) = V(Q) + L + \ell(x - Q)$. By the principle of smoothness, the left and right derivatives of V at S should be equal, i.e. $V'(S) = \ell$, that is the second equality in (2.5). Finally, starting from state S, if it is optimal to jump state Q, then Q should be chosen by minimizing $V(Q) + L + \ell(S - Q)$. The first order optimality condition would be $V'(Q) = \ell$, which is the first equality in (2.5). It is similar that we should have (2.4).

The structural property of $w^\star(x)$ with respect to x is a byproduct when we find parameters $q^\star$, $Q^\star$, $S^\star$, $\gamma^\star$ and a continuously differentiable function $w^\star(\cdot)$ such that (2.1)-(2.5) are satisfied.

We will prove Theorem 2.1 in Section 3, which is the main technique contribution in this paper, and show the optimality of selected $\phi^\star = \{(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star), \{\mu^\star(z) : z \in [0, S^\star]\}\}$ (i.e. Theorem 2.2) in Section 4 using the lower bound approach, which has been adopted in literature, e.g., [11, 20].

3 Existence of optimal policy parameters

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.1, which shows the existence of the optimal policy parameters satisfying (2.1)-(2.5). The optimality of the policy with these parameters will be proven in Section 4.

We will use two subsections to prove Theorem 2.1. In Subsection 3.1, we solve the ODE (2.1) with given $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and a boundary condition $w(0) = w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and provide the structural properties of w with respect to x, w_0 and γ; see Lemmas 3.2-3.3. Then, in Subsection 3.2, we determine $(w_0^\star, \gamma^\star, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star)$ by the five boundary conditions (2.2)-(2.5); see Lemmas 3.4-3.6.

Before proving Theorem 2.1, recall the definitions of $\pi(w)$ and $\mu(w)$ in (2.6), we first give the following lemma, which states the basic properties of $\pi(w)$ and $\mu(w)$.

Lemma 3.1. *$\pi(w)$ is concave and Lipschitz continuous in $w \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e., for any w_1 and w_2 with $w_1 < w_2$, we have*

$$|\pi(w_1) - \pi(w_2)| \leq M|w_1 - w_2|. \tag{3.1}$$

where $M = \max\{|\underline{\mu}|, |\bar{\mu}|\}$. Furthermore, $\mu(w)$ is decreasing in w.

Remark 3.1. *It follows from (3.1) (by letting $w_1 = w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ and $w_2 = 0$) and (3.3) that*

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 w'(x; w_0, \gamma) + M|w(x; w_0, \gamma)| + \pi(0) + h(x) \geq \gamma, \tag{3.2}$$

which will be used in the following discussions.

3.1 Solving the ODE (2.1)

In this subsection, we will solve the ODE (2.1) by assigning an initial value $w(0) = w_0$ and fixing γ, and then characterize the properties of the solution $w(\cdot)$.

Consider the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 w'(x) + \pi(w(x)) + h(x) = \gamma \quad \text{for } x \geq 0, \\ &\quad \text{subject to } w(0) = w_0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

We denote the solution of the above problem by $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ if it exists. Then we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $h(\cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 1. The following results hold:*

(a) *For any $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, problem (3.3) has a unique continuous differentiable solution $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$.*

(b) *$w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is continuous in $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $w'(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is continuous in $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$.*

(c) *For fixed $x > 0$ and $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and*

$$\lim_{\gamma \to \pm\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = \pm\infty. \tag{3.4}$$

(*d*) *For fixed* $x \geq 0$ *and* $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ *is strictly increasing in* $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ *and*

$$\lim_{w_0 \to \pm\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = \pm\infty.$$

Proof. (*a*) Note that $\pi(w)$ is Lipschitz continuous (see Lemma 3.1). It follows from Picard's existence theorem (see, e.g., Theorem 10 in Section 1.7 of [1]) that there exists a unique continuous solution $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ to (3.3) on the interval $[0, \infty)$ with boundary condition $w(0) = w_0$.

(*b*) It follows from Theorem II-1-2 in [17] that $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is continuous in $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Further, part (a), (3.3), and Assumption 1 immediately imply that $w'(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is continuous in $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$.

(*c*) We first show that for any fixed $x > 0$ and $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$, we want to show that $w(x; w_0, \gamma_1) < w(x; w_0, \gamma_2)$ for all $x > 0$. Suppose that $w(x; w_0, \gamma_1) \geq w(x; w_0, \gamma_2)$ for some $x > 0$. Define $x_\gamma = \inf\{x > 0 : w(x; w_0, \gamma_1) \geq w(x; w_0, \gamma_2)\}$. Let

$$f_\gamma(x) = w(x; w_0, \gamma_2) - w(x; w_0, \gamma_1).$$

The following proof is divided into two cases: $x_\gamma > 0$ or $x_\gamma = 0$.

If $x_\gamma > 0$, then it follows from the continuity of $w(\cdot; w_0, \gamma_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, that $w(x_\gamma; w_0, \gamma_1) = w(x_\gamma; w_0, \gamma_2)$ and $w(x; w_0, \gamma_1) < w(x, w_0, \gamma_2)$ for all $x \in (0, x_\gamma)$. Then $f_\gamma(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (0, x_\gamma)$ and $f_\gamma(x_\gamma) = f_\gamma(0) = 0$. By the continuity of $f_\gamma(\cdot)$, there exists two numbers $x_1, x_2 \in (0, x_\gamma)$ with $x_1 < x_2$ such that $f_\gamma(x_1) > f_\gamma(x_2)$ and $M f_\gamma(x) < \gamma_2 - \gamma_1$ for all $x \in [x_1, x_2]$, where M has been defined in Lemma 3.1. Moreover, it follows from (3.3) that

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 f'_\gamma(x) + \pi(w(x; w_0, \gamma_2)) - \pi(w(x; w_0, \gamma_1)) = \gamma_2 - \gamma_1, \text{ for } x \geq 0. \tag{3.5}$$

Integrating (3.5) from x_1 to x_2 and using (3.1) yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) \cdot (x_2 - x_1) \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 (f_\gamma(x_2) - f_\gamma(x_1)) + \int_{x_1}^{x_2} (\pi(w(y; w_0; \gamma_2)) - \pi(w(y; w_0; \gamma_1)))\, \mathrm{d}y \\
&\quad < \int_{x_1}^{x_2} (\pi(w(y; w_0; \gamma_2)) - \pi(w(y; w_0; \gamma_1)))\, \mathrm{d}y \\
&\quad \leq \int_{x_1}^{x_2} M f_\gamma(y)\, \mathrm{d}y \\
&\quad \leq (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) \cdot (x_2 - x_1),
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

If $x_\gamma = 0$, then there exists a sequence $\{x_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $x_n \downarrow 0$ as $n \to \infty$ and $f_\gamma(x_n) \leq 0$. Therefore,

$$\frac{f_\gamma(x_n)}{x_n} \leq 0, \text{ for all } n \geq 1.$$

Since $f_\gamma(0) = 0$, taking the limit as $n \to \infty$ gives $f'_\gamma(0) \leq 0$, which contradicts (3.5) with $x = 0$. Therefore, we have proven that $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ for any given $x > 0$.

Next, we prove that $\lim_{\gamma \to \infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = \infty$ for any given $x > 0$ and $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Now fix any

$x_3 > 0$ and $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. We want to show that $\lim_{\gamma\to\infty} w(x_3; w_0, \gamma) = \infty$. First, we claim that for any fixed $x_4 \in (0, x_3)$, $w(x_4; w_0, \gamma) \geq 0$ when γ is sufficiently large. We argue that when γ is sufficiently large, there exists a number $x_5 \in (0, x_4]$ such that $w(x_5; w_0, \gamma) \geq 0$. Otherwise, $w(x; w_0, \gamma) < 0$ for all $0 < x \leq x_4$ and thus (3.2) implies that for all $0 < x \leq x_4$,

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 w'(x; w_0, \gamma) - Mw(x; w_0, \gamma) \geq \gamma - \pi(0) - h(x).$$

Denote $\xi = 2M/\sigma^2$. Then we have that for all $0 < x \leq x_4$,

$$w(x; w_0, \gamma) \quad \geq \quad w_0 e^{\xi x} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2}\int_0^x \big[\gamma - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{\xi(x-y)}\,\mathrm{d}y,$$

and thus $w(x_4; w_0, \gamma)$ will be greater than 0 if γ is sufficiently large. Hence, this contradiction implies that there exists a number $x_5 \in (0, x_4]$ (which might depend on γ) such that $w(x_5; w_0, \gamma) \geq 0$ when γ is sufficiently large. We choose γ sufficiently large such that $\gamma > \pi(0) + h(x)$ for all $x \in [0, x_4]$. Then it follows from (3.3) that if $w(x; w_0, \gamma) = 0$, then $w'(x; w_0, \gamma) > 0$. Thus, the continuity of $w(\cdot; w_0, \gamma)$ and $w(x_5; w_0, \gamma) \geq 0$ imply that for all $x \geq x_5$, $w(x; w_0, \gamma) \geq 0$. Typically, for all $x \in [x_4, x_3]$, $w(x; w_0, \gamma) \geq 0$. Hence, (3.2) implies that for all $x \in [x_4, x_3]$,

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 w'(x; w_0, \gamma) + Mw(x; w_0, \gamma) \geq \gamma - \pi(0) - h(x),$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} w(x_3; w_0, \gamma) \quad &\geq \quad w(x_4; w_0, \gamma) e^{-\xi(x_3 - x_4)} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2}\int_{x_4}^{x_3} \big[\gamma - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{-\xi(x_3 - y)}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\geq \quad \frac{2}{\sigma^2}\int_{x_4}^{x_3} \big[\gamma - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{-\xi(x_3 - y)}\,\mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\gamma \to \infty$ in the inequality above yields $\lim_{\gamma\to\infty} w(x_3; w_0, \gamma) = \infty$.

The proof for $\lim_{\gamma\to-\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = -\infty$ is similar and thus is omitted for brevity.

(d) Choose two numbers $w_0^\dagger$ and $w_0^\ddagger$ satisfying $w_0^\dagger < w_0^\ddagger$. We want to show that $w(x; w_0^\dagger, \gamma) < w(x; w_0^\ddagger, \gamma)$ for all $x \geq 0$. Obviously, it holds for $x = 0$. Suppose that $w(x; w_0^\dagger, \gamma) \geq w(x; w_0^\ddagger, \gamma)$ for some $x > 0$. Define $x_w = \inf\{x > 0 : w(x; w_0^\dagger, \gamma) \geq w(x; w_0^\ddagger, \gamma)\}$. Since $w(0; w_0^\dagger) = w_0^\dagger < w_0^\ddagger = w(0; w_0^\ddagger)$, it follows from the continuity of $w(\cdot; w_0^\dagger, \gamma)$ and $w(\cdot; w_0^\ddagger, \gamma)$ that $x_w > 0$, $w(x_w; w_0^\dagger, \gamma) = w(x_w; w_0^\ddagger, \gamma)$ and $w(x; w_0^\dagger, \gamma) < w(x, w_0^\ddagger, \gamma)$ for all $x \in (0, x_w)$. Let

$$f_w(x) = w(x; w_0^\ddagger, \gamma) - w(x; w_0^\dagger, \gamma)$$

Then, $f_w(x) > 0$ for all $x \in [0, x_w)$ and $f_w(x_w) = 0$. By the continuity of $f_w(\cdot)$, there exists a number $x_6 \in (0, x_w)$ such that

$$M(x_w - x_6) < \sigma^2/2 \quad \text{and} \quad f_w(x) \leq f_w(x_6) \quad \text{for all } x \in [x_6, x_w]. \tag{3.6}$$

Moreover, it follows from (3.3) that

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 f_w'(x) + \pi(w(x; w_0^\ddagger, \gamma)) - \pi(w(x; w_0^\dagger, \gamma)) = 0 \quad \text{for } x \geq 0. \tag{3.7}$$

Integrating (3.7) from x_6 to x_w and using (3.1) yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(f_w(x_w) - f_w(x_6)) + \int_{x_6}^{x_w} (\pi(w(y; w_0^{\ddagger}; \gamma)) - \pi(w(y; w_0^{\dagger}; \gamma)))\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&< -\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 f_w(x_6) + \int_{x_6}^{x_w} M f_w(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 f_w(x_6) + (x_w - x_6) M f_w(x_6) \\
&< 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from $f_w(x_w) = 0$ and (3.1), the last two inequalities follow from (3.6). This is a contradiction. Therefore, $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly increasing in w_0 for all $x \geq 0$.

Finally, the proof for $\lim_{w_0 \to \pm\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = \pm\infty$ is quite similar to that for $\lim_{\gamma \to \pm\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = \pm\infty$ and is omitted for brevity. □

The following lemma characterizes the monotonicity of $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ when γ takes different values.

Lemma 3.3. *Fix $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. There exists a number $\bar{\gamma}(w_0)$ (might be infinite) with $\bar{\gamma}(w_0) > \pi(w_0)$ such that the follows hold.*

(a) *If $\gamma \leq \pi(w_0)$, then $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly decreasing in $x \in (0, \infty)$ and*

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = -\infty. \tag{3.8}$$

(b) *If $\gamma \geq \bar{\gamma}(w_0)$, then $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $x \in [0, \infty)$ and*

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = \infty. \tag{3.9}$$

(c) *If $\pi(w_0) < \gamma < \bar{\gamma}(w_0)$, then there exists a unique $x^\star(w_0, \gamma)$ such that $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $[0, x^\star(w_0, \gamma))$ and strictly decreasing in $(x^\star(w_0, \gamma), \infty)$. Furthermore, $\lim_{x \to \infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = -\infty$.*

Remark 3.2. *For convenience, in the following sections, we let $x^\star(w_0, \gamma) = 0$ if $\gamma \leq \pi(w_0)$ and $x^\star(w_0, \gamma) = \infty$ if $\gamma \geq \bar{\gamma}(w_0)$.*

Proof. Before proving (a)-(c), we first claim the following property: There do not exist two numbers x_1 and x_2 with $x_1 < x_2$ such that

$$w(x_1; w_0, \gamma) = w(x_2; w_0, \gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad w'(x_1; w_0, \gamma) \leq 0 \leq w'(x_2; w_0, \gamma). \tag{3.10}$$

Because it follows from (3.3) with $x = x_1$ and $x = x_2$ that

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{2} w'(x_1; w_0, \gamma) + \pi(w(x_1; w_0, \gamma)) + h(x_1) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} w'(x_2; w_0, \gamma) + \pi(w(x_2; w_0, \gamma)) + h(x_2),$$

which is impossible with (3.10) and $h(x_1) < h(x_2)$ (using Assumption 1). This properties implies that

(i) $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ can not have a local minimizer in $x \in (0, \infty)$; and

(ii) $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ can not be a constant in any interval $[x_1, x_2]$ with $0 \le x_1 < x_2 < \infty$.

Next we will use properties (i)-(ii) to prove (a)-(c). First, taking $x = 0$ in (3.3), we have

$$w'(0; w_0, \gamma) = \gamma - \pi(w_0). \tag{3.11}$$

Furthermore, define

$$\bar{\gamma}(w_0) = \sup\{\gamma > \pi(w_0) : \text{there exisits an } x > 0 \text{ such that } w'(x; w_0, \gamma) < 0\}. \tag{3.12}$$

Notice that $\bar{\gamma}(w_0)$ is well defined although it might be ∞.

(*a*) The proof is divided into two cases when $\gamma < \pi(w_0)$ or $\gamma = \pi(w_0)$.

If $\gamma < \pi(w_0)$, (3.11) implies that $w'(0; w_0, \gamma) < 0$. The continuity of $w'(x; w_0, \gamma)$ with respect to x and properties (i)-(ii) immediately imply that $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly decreasing in x for $x > 0$.

If $\gamma = \pi(w_0)$, using the results when $\gamma < \pi(w_0)$ and the continuity of $w'(x; w_0, \gamma)$ in γ , we must have $w'(x; w_0, \gamma) \le 0$ for $x > 0$, and property (ii) further implies that $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly decreasing in x for $x > 0$.

Next we show that $\lim_{x\to\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = -\infty$. Otherwise, there exists a finite number $\underline{w}$ such that $\lim_{x\to\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = \underline{w}$ and thus $\lim_{x\to\infty} w'(x; w_0, \gamma) = 0$. Taking $x \to \infty$ in (3.3) yields that $\lim_{x\to\infty} h(x) = \gamma - \pi(\underline{w})$, which contradicts with Assumption 1.

(*b*) If $\gamma \ge \bar{\gamma}(w_0)$, then by the definition of $\bar{\gamma}(w_0)$ in (3.12) and the continuity of $w'(x; w_0, \gamma)$ in γ, we have that $w'(x; w_0, \gamma) \ge 0$ for all $x \ge 0$. Then property (ii) implies that $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly increasing in x.

Next, we show that $\lim_{x\to\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = \infty$. Otherwise, there exists a finite number $\bar{w}$ such that $\lim_{x\to\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = \bar{w}$ and thus $\lim_{x\to\infty} w'(x; w_0, \gamma) = 0$. Letting $x \to \infty$ in (3.3) yields that $\lim_{x\to\infty} h(x) = \gamma - \pi(\bar{w})$, which contradicts with Assumption 1.

(*c*) Finally, we consider the case when $\pi(w_0) < \gamma < \bar{\gamma}(w_0)$. First, we claim that for each $\gamma \in (\pi(w_0), \bar{\gamma}(w_0))$, there exists a number $x > 0$ such that $w'(x; w_0, \gamma) < 0$. If it fails to hold, we have that $w'(x; w_0, \gamma) \ge 0$ for all $x > 0$. Using similar arguments for proving (3.9) in part (b), we can obtain that

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = \infty. \tag{3.13}$$

On the other hand, using the definition of $\bar{\gamma}(w_0)$ and the continuity of $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ in γ, there exists a number $\gamma^\dagger \in (\gamma, \bar{\gamma}(w_0))$ such that $w'(x^\dagger; w_0, \gamma^\dagger) < 0$ for some $x^\dagger > 0$. Then, we must have that $w(x; w_0, \gamma^\dagger)$ is strictly decreasing for $x \ge x^\dagger$ and

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma^\dagger) = -\infty \tag{3.14}$$

(the analysis would be very similar to that for part (a) and thus is omitted). However, (3.13) and (3.14) contradict with Lemma 3.2 (c) with $\gamma^\dagger > \gamma$. Thus, we have proven that for each $\gamma \in (\pi(w_0), \bar{\gamma}(w_0))$, there exists a number $x > 0$ such that $w'(x; w_0, \gamma) < 0$. Define

$$x^\star(w_0, \gamma) = \inf\{x \ge 0 : w'(x; w_0, \gamma) < 0\}.$$

Since $w'(0; w_0, \gamma) = \gamma - \pi(w_0) > 0$ and $w'(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is continuous in x, we have $x^\star(w_0, \gamma) > 0$, $w'(x; w_0, \gamma) \geq 0$ for $x \in [0, x^\star(w_0, \gamma))$ and $w'(x^\star(w_0, \gamma); w_0, \gamma) = 0$. Further, the properties (i)-(ii) imply that $w(x^\star(w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $[0, x^\star(w_0, \gamma))$ and strictly decreasing in $(x^\star(w_0, \gamma), \infty)$.

Finally, the proof for $\lim_{x\to\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma) = -\infty$ is very similar to that for proving (3.8) and thus is omitted. □

3.2 Determining optimal parameters by (2.2)-(2.5)

In the previous subsection, we have solved (2.1) for a given pair $(w_0, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. In this subsection, we determine the optimal policy parameters $(q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star)$ and auxiliary parameters $(w_0^\star, \gamma^\star)$ by solving the boundary conditions (2.2)-(2.5). Specifically, in Lemma 3.4, we show that for $w_0 < \ell$, there exist $\gamma_1^\star(w_0)$, $Q(w_0)$ and $S(w_0)$ with $\gamma_1^\star(w_0) \in (\pi(w_0), \bar{\gamma}(w_0))$ and $0 < Q(w_0) < x^\star(w_0, \gamma_1^\star(w_0)) < S(w_0)$ such that

$$w(Q(w_0); w_0, \gamma_1^\star(w_0)) = w(S(w_0); w_0, \gamma_1^\star(w_0)) = \ell \quad \text{and} \tag{3.15}$$

$$\int_{Q(w_0)}^{S(w_0)} \left[w(x; w_0, \gamma_1^\star(w_0)) - \ell\right] \mathrm{d}x = L. \tag{3.16}$$

In Lemma 3.5, we prove that for $w_0 < \bar{w}_0 < -k$, there exist $\gamma_2^\star(w_0)$ and $q(w_0)$ with $\gamma_2^\star(w_0) \in (\pi(w_0), \infty)$ and $q(w_0) > 0$ such that

$$w(q(w_0); w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) = -k \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^{q(w_0)} \left[w(x; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) + k\right] \mathrm{d}x = -K, \tag{3.17}$$

where $\bar{w}_0$ is a number satisfying $\bar{w}_0 < -k$. Finally, in Lemma 3.6, we show that we can choose a $w_0^\star$ with $w_0^\star < \bar{w}_0$ such that

$$\gamma_1^\star(w_0^\star) = \gamma_2^\star(w_0^\star). \tag{3.18}$$

Let $\gamma^\star = \gamma_1^\star(w_0^\star)$, $q^\star = q(w_0^\star)$, $Q^\star = Q(w_0^\star)$, $S^\star = S(w_0^\star)$ and $x^\star = x^\star(w_0^\star, \gamma^\star)$. Figure 1 depicts the function w and the optimal policy parameters. Recall that w is a solution for (2.1) and now (3.15)-(3.17) ensure (2.2)-(2.5), and hence we have finished the proof for Theorem 2.1. Therefore, we next only need to prove (3.15)-(3.18) by the following Lemmas 3.4-3.6.

Recalling the definition of $\bar{\gamma}(w_0)$ in Lemma 3.3, we first have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. (*a*) *For any $w_0 < \ell$, there exists a finite number $\gamma_1(w_0)$ with $\gamma_1(w_0) \in (\pi(w_0), \bar{\gamma}(w_0))$ such that for any $\gamma \in (\gamma_1(w_0), \bar{\gamma}(w_0))$, there exist two numbers $Q(w_0, \gamma)$ and $S(w_0, \gamma)$ with $0 < Q(w_0, \gamma) < x^\star(w_0, \gamma) < S(w_0, \gamma)$ satisfying*

$$w(Q(w_0, \gamma); w_0, \gamma) = w(S(w_0, \gamma); w_0, \gamma) = \ell.$$

(*b*) *For any $w_0 < \ell$, there exists a finite number $\gamma_1^\star(w_0)$ with $\gamma_1^\star(w_0) \in (\gamma_1(w_0), \bar{\gamma}(w_0))$ such that*

$$f_1(w_0, \gamma_1^\star(w_0)) = L, \tag{3.19}$$

where $f_1(w_0, \gamma) := \int_0^\infty (w(x; w_0, \gamma) - \ell)^+ \mathrm{d}x$ is strictly increasing in $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, $\gamma_1^\star(w_0)$



Figure 1: Optimal parameters and corresponding function

is continuous and strictly decreasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty, w_0)$.

Remark 3.3. *Let* $Q(w_0) = Q(w_0, \gamma_1^\star(w_0))$ *and* $S(w_0) = S(w_0, \gamma_1^\star(w_0))$*, Lemma 3.4 immediately implies* (3.15) *and* (3.16).

Proof. (a) For $w_0 < \ell$, define

$$\gamma_1(w_0) = \inf\{\gamma \in (\pi(w_0), \bar{\gamma}(w_0)) : w(x^\star(w_0, \gamma); w_0, \gamma) \geq \ell\}.$$

It follows from Lemma 3.3 (c) that

$$w(x^\star(w_0, \gamma); w_0, \gamma) = \max_{x \geq 0} w(x; w_0, \gamma), \tag{3.20}$$

which, together with Lemma 3.2 (c) and (d), implies that $w(x^\star(w_0, \gamma); w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $\gamma \in (\pi(w_0), \bar{\gamma}(w_0))$ and $w_0 \in (-\infty, \ell)$, respectively. Furthermore, Lemma 3.3 (b) and (c) imply that $\lim_{\gamma \to \bar{\gamma}(w_0)} w(x^\star(w_0, \gamma); w_0, \gamma) = \infty$. Hence, $\gamma_1(w_0)$ is well defined, finite and strictly decreasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty, \ell)$. Using the continuity of $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ in γ, the definition of $\gamma_1(w_0)$ and (3.20), we also have

$$w(x^\star(w_0, \gamma_1(w_0)); w_0, \gamma_1(w_0)) = \ell.$$

For $\gamma \in (\gamma_1(w_0), \bar{\gamma}(w_0))$, define

$$Q(w_0, \gamma) = \inf\{x \geq 0 : w(x; w_0, \gamma) = \ell\} \text{ and } S(w_0, \gamma) = \sup\{x \geq 0 : w(x; w_0, \gamma) = \ell\}.$$

Then, it follows from Lemma 3.3 (*c*) and $w_0 < \ell$ that both $Q(w_0, \gamma)$ and $S(w_0, \gamma)$ are well defined and finite, and then $0 < Q(w_0, \gamma) < x^\star(w_0, \gamma) < S(w_0, \gamma)$ and $w(Q(w_0, \gamma); w_0, \gamma) = w(S(w_0, \gamma); w_0, \gamma) = \ell$.

(b) Notice that $f_1(w_0, \gamma) := \int_0^\infty (w(x; w_0, \gamma) - \ell)^+ \, \mathrm{d}x$. Hence, Lemma 3.2 (c), Lemma 3.3 and

the definitions of $Q(w_0,\gamma)$ and $S(w_0,\gamma)$ imply that

$$f_1(w_0,\gamma)=\begin{cases}0 & \text{for } \gamma\in(-\infty,\gamma_1(w_0)],\\ \int_{Q(w_0,\gamma)}^{S(w_0,\gamma)}[w(x;w_0,\gamma)-\ell]\,\mathrm{d}x & \text{for } \gamma\in(\gamma_1(w_0),\bar\gamma(w_0)),\\ \infty & \text{for } \gamma\in[\bar\gamma(w_0),\infty),\end{cases}$$

and $f_1(w_0,\gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $\gamma\in(\gamma_1(w_0),\bar\gamma(w_0))$. Thus, we have

$$\lim_{\gamma\to\gamma_1(w_0)} f_1(w_0,\gamma)=0 \quad\text{and}\quad \lim_{\gamma\to\bar\gamma(w_0)} f_1(w_0,\gamma)=\infty,$$

which, together with the continuity of $f_1(w_0,\gamma)$ in $\gamma\in(\gamma_1(w_0),\bar\gamma(w_0))$ (the continuity of $f_1(w_0,\gamma)$ can be implied by the continuity of $w(x;w_0,\gamma)$, imply that there exists a unique $\gamma_1^\star(w_0)\in(\gamma_1(w_0),\bar\gamma(w_0))$ such that $f_1(w_0,\gamma_1^\star(w_0))=L$.

It remains to prove that $\gamma_1^\star(w_0)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing in $w_0\in(-\infty,w_0)$. First, it follows from Lemma 3.2 (d) and the definition of $f_1(w_0,\gamma)$ that $f_1(w_0,\gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $w_0\in(-\infty,\ell)$. Besides, $f_1(w_0,\gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $\gamma\in(\gamma_1(w_0),\bar\gamma(w_0))$. Hence, $\gamma_1^\star(w_0)$ is strictly decreasing in $w_0\in(-\infty,\ell)$. The continuity of $\gamma_1^\star(w_0)$ can be implied by the monotonicity of $f_1(w_0,\gamma)$ in $\gamma\in(\gamma_1(w_0),\bar\gamma(w_0))$, the continuity of $f_1(w_0,\gamma)$ in $w_0\in(-\infty,\ell)$, and the Implicit Function Theorem (see e.g., Theorem 1.1 in [25]). □

Lemma 3.5. (*a*) *For any $w_0<-k$, there exists a number $\gamma_2(w_0)$ with $\gamma_2(w_0)\in(\pi(w_0),\gamma_1(w_0))$ such that*

$$w(x^\star(w_0,\gamma_2(w_0)),w_0,\gamma_2(w_0))=-k, \tag{3.21}$$

and for any $\gamma>\gamma_2(w_0)$, there exists a number $q(w_0,\gamma)$ with $0<q(w_0,\gamma)<x^\star(w_0,\gamma)$ such that

$$w(q(w_0,\gamma);w_0,\gamma)=-k.$$

(*b*) *There exists a number $\bar w_0<-k$ such that*

$$f_2(\bar w_0,\gamma_2(\bar w_0))=-K, \tag{3.22}$$

and for any $w_0<\bar w_0$, there exists a number $\gamma_2^\star(w_0)$ with $\gamma_2^\star(w_0)>\gamma_2(w_0)$ and

$$f_2(w_0,\gamma_2^\star(w_0))=-K, \tag{3.23}$$

where $f_2(w_0,\gamma):=\int_0^{q(w_0,\gamma)}[w(x;w_0,\gamma)+k]\,\mathrm{d}x$. Furthermore, $\gamma_2^\star(w_0)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing in $w_0\in(-\infty,\bar w_0)$, and

$$\lim_{w_0\to-\infty}\gamma_2^\star(w_0)=\infty. \tag{3.24}$$

Remark 3.4. *Let $q(w_0)=q(w_0,\gamma_2^\star(w_0))$, then Lemma 3.5 immediately implies* (3.17).

Proof. (*a*) For $w_0<-k$, define

$$\gamma_2(w_0)=\inf\{\gamma\in(\pi(w_0),\bar\gamma(w_0)):w(x^\star(w_0,\gamma);w_0,\gamma)\ge-k\}. \tag{3.25}$$

Recall the fact that $w(x^\star(w_0,\gamma);w_0,\gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $\gamma \in (\pi(w_0),\bar{\gamma}(w_0))$, tends to ∞ as γ goes to $\bar{\gamma}(w_0)$ (from the argument after (3.20)) and tends to $w_0 < -k$ as γ goes to $\pi(w_0)$ (see Lemma 3.3). Then, $\gamma_2(w_0)$ is well defined and (3.21) holds. For $\gamma \in (\gamma_2(w_0),\infty)$, define

$$q(w_0,\gamma) = \inf\{x \geq 0 : w(x;w_0,\gamma) = -k\}. \tag{3.26}$$

Since $w(x^\star(w_0,\gamma);w_0,\gamma) > -k$ for $\gamma \in (\gamma_2(w_0),\bar{\gamma}(w_0))$ and $w(x^\star(w_0,\gamma);w_0,\gamma) = \infty$ for $\gamma \in [\bar{\gamma}(w_0),\infty)$ (see Remark 3.2), we have that $q(w_0,\gamma)$ is well defined and $0 < q(w_0,\gamma) < x^\star(w_0,\gamma)$.

(*b*) We first prove (3.22). Recall $f_2(w_0,\gamma_2(w_0)) = \int_0^{q(w_0,\gamma_2(w_0))}[w(x;w_0,\gamma_2(w_0)) + k]\,\mathrm{d}x$. If we can show that $f_2(w_0,\gamma_2(w_0))$ is strictly increasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty,-k)$,

$$\lim_{w_0\to -k} f_2(w_0,\gamma_2(w_0)) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{w_0\to-\infty} f_2(w_0,\gamma_2(w_0)) = -\infty, \tag{3.27}$$

then, $\bar{w}_0$ can be defined as

$$\bar{w}_0 = \sup\{w_0 \leq -k : f_2(w_0,\gamma_2(w_0)) = -K\}$$

and the continuity of $f_2(w_0,\gamma)$ (the proof for the continuity of f_2 is similar to that of f_1, and thus is omitted) implies that (3.22) holds. We put the proof for that $f_2(w_0,\gamma_2(w_0))$ is strictly increasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty,-k)$ and (3.27) in Appendix B.

We next prove that for any $w_0 < \bar{w}_0$, there exists a $\gamma^\star(w_0)$ with $\gamma^\star(w_0) > \gamma_2(w_0)$ such that (3.23) holds. First since $f_2(w_0,\gamma_2(w_0))$ is strictly increasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty,-k)$, we have that for $w_0 < \bar{w}_0$,

$$f_2(w_0,\gamma_2(w_0)) < f_2(\bar{w}_0,\gamma_2(\bar{w}_0)) = -K. \tag{3.28}$$

Furthermore, (3.4) and the definition of $q(w_0,\gamma)$ in (3.26) imply that $\lim_{\gamma\to\infty} q(w_0,\gamma) = 0$ and then

$$\lim_{\gamma\to\infty} f_2(w_0,\gamma) = 0,$$

which, together with (3.28) and the continuity of $f_2(w_0,\gamma)$ in γ, implies that there exists a $\gamma^\star(w_0)$ with $\gamma^\star(w_0) > \gamma_2(w_0)$ such that (3.23) holds.

Finally, we prove that $\gamma_2^\star(w_0)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty,\bar{w}_0)$, and (3.24) holds. The continuity can be obtained by the Implicit Function Theorem and is omitted. If we can prove that $f_2(w_0,\gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty,\bar{w}_0)$ and $\gamma \in (\gamma_2(w_0),\infty)$ respectively, then $f_2(w_0,\gamma_2^\star(w_0)) = -K$ implies that $\gamma_2^\star(w_0)$ is strictly decreasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty,\bar{w}_0)$. We next only prove that $f_2(w_0,\gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $\gamma \in (\gamma_2(w_0),\infty)$, and the proof for the monotonicity in $w_0 \in (-\infty,\bar{w}_0)$ is very similar and is omitted. Since $w(x;w_0,\gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ (see Lemma 3.2 (c)) and $w(x;w_0,\gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $x \in (0,x^\star(w_0,\gamma))$ (see Lemma 3.3 (b) and (c)), $w(q(w_0,\gamma);w_0,\gamma) = -k$ implies that $q(w_0,\gamma)$ is strictly decreasing in $\gamma \in (\gamma_2(w_0),\infty)$. Therefore, for any $\gamma^\dagger$ and $\gamma^\ddagger$ satisfying $\gamma_2(w_0) \leq \gamma^\dagger < \gamma^\ddagger$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(w_0,\gamma^\dagger) &= \int_0^{q(w_0,\gamma^\dagger)} (w(x;w_0,\gamma^\dagger) + k)\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \int_0^{q(w_0,\gamma^\ddagger)} (w(x;w_0,\gamma^\dagger) + k)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &< \int_0^{q(w_0,\gamma^\ddagger)} (w(x;w_0,\gamma^\ddagger) + k)\,\mathrm{d}x = f_2(w_0,\gamma^\ddagger), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from that $q(w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly decreasing in $\gamma \in (\gamma_2(w_0), \infty)$ and $w(x; w_0, \gamma^\dagger) \le -k$ for $x \le q(w_0, \gamma^\dagger)$, and the second inequality follows from that $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ (Lemma 3.2 (c)) and $q(w_0, \gamma^\ddagger) > 0$. Hence, $f_2(w_0, \gamma)$ is strictly increasing in $\gamma \in (\gamma_2(w_0), \infty)$.

It remains to prove (3.24). Suppose that it fails to hold, then the fact that $\gamma_2^\star(w_0)$ is strictly decreasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty, \bar{w}_0)$ implies that there exist a finite number $\bar{\gamma}_2^\dagger$ such that

$$\gamma_2^\star(w_0) \le \bar{\gamma}_2^\dagger \quad \text{for all } w_0 < \bar{w}_0.$$

Since, $w(x; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \le -k < 0$ for $x \in [0, q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))]$, by the definition of $\pi(w)$, we have

$$\pi(w(x; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))) \ge \bar{\mu} w(x; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) + \underline{c} \quad \text{for } x \in [0, q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))],$$

where $\underline{c} = \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{U}} c(\mu)$. It follows from (3.3) that for $0 \le x \le q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))$

$$1/2\sigma^2 w'(x; w_0, \gamma) + \bar{\mu} w(x; w_0, \gamma) + \underline{c} + h(x) \le \gamma,$$

which yields that for $x \in [0, q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))]$,

$$w(x; w_0, \gamma) \le w_0 e^{-\eta x} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_0^x \big[\gamma - \underline{c} - h(y)\big] e^{-\eta(x-y)} \, \mathrm{d}y, \tag{3.29}$$

where $\eta = 2\bar{\mu}/\sigma^2$. Thus, letting $x = q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))$ and $\gamma = \gamma_2^\star(w_0)$ in (3.29) and using $w(q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))) = -k$ and $\gamma_2^\star(w_0) \le \bar{\gamma}_2^\dagger$, we have that for all $w_0 < \bar{w}_0$,

$$w_0 e^{-\eta q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_0^{q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))} \big[\bar{\gamma}_2^\dagger - \underline{c} - h(y)\big] e^{-\eta(q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) - y)} \, \mathrm{d}y \ge -k. \tag{3.30}$$

Define $g(x; w_0) = w_0 e^{-\eta x} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_0^x [\bar{\gamma}_2^\dagger - \underline{c} - h(y)] e^{-\eta(x-y)} \, \mathrm{d}y$, then for all $w_0 < \bar{w}_0$,

$$g(q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)); \bar{w}_0) > g(q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)); w_0) \ge -k, \tag{3.31}$$

where the last inequality follows from (3.30). Let

$$\underline{q} = \inf\{x > 0 : g(x; \bar{w}_0) \ge -k\},$$

and then (3.31) and $g(0; \bar{w}_0) = \bar{w}_0 < -k$ imply that for all $w_0 < \bar{w}_0$,

$$0 < \underline{q} < q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)). \tag{3.32}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(w_0,\gamma_2^\star(w_0)) &= \int_0^{q(w_0,\gamma_2^\star(w_0))} \big[w(x;w_0,\gamma_2^\star(w_0))+k\big]\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\le \int_0^{\underline{q}} \big[w(x;w_0,\gamma_2^\star(w_0))+k\big]\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\le \int_0^{\underline{q}} \Big[w_0 e^{-\eta x} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2}\int_0^x \big[\gamma_2^\star(w_0)-\underline{c}-h(y)\big]e^{-\eta(x-y)}dy + k\Big]\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\le \int_0^{\underline{q}} \big[g(x;w_0)+k\big]\,\mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from (3.32) and $w(x;w_0,\gamma_2^\star(w_0))+k\le 0$ for $0\le x\le q(w_0,\gamma_2^\star(w_0))$, the second inequality follows from (3.29), the last inequality follows from $\gamma_2^\star(w_0)\le\bar{\gamma}_2^\dagger$. Then, it follows from $\lim_{w_0\to-\infty} g(x;w_0)=-\infty$ for all $x\in[0,\underline{q}]$ that

$$\lim_{w_0\to-\infty} f_2(w_0,\gamma_2^\star(w_0)) = -\infty,$$

which contradicts with $f_2(w_0,\gamma_2^\star(w_0))=-K$. Thus, we have proven (3.24) and finished the proof. □

Lemma 3.6. *There exists a $w_0^\star$ with $w_0^\star<\bar{w}_0$ such that* (3.18) *holds.*

Proof. We use two steps to prove this lemma. First, we show that

$$\gamma_2^\star(\bar{w}_0) < \gamma_1^\star(\bar{w}_0). \tag{3.33}$$

Second, we prove that there exists a number $\underline{w}_0<\bar{w}_0$ such that

$$\gamma_2^\star(\underline{w}_0) \ge \gamma_1^\star(\underline{w}_0). \tag{3.34}$$

Thus, (3.33), (3.34), and the continuity of $\gamma_1^\star(w_0)$ and $\gamma_2^\star(w_0)$ imply that there exists a number $w_0^\star$ such that (3.18) holds. We next prove (3.33) and (3.34).

Frist, we prove (3.33). It follows from (3.21) and $\bar{w}_0<-k$ that

$$w(x^\star(\bar{w}_0,\gamma_2^\star(\bar{w}_0));\bar{w}_0,\gamma_2^\star(\bar{w}_0)) = -k < \ell, \tag{3.35}$$

which implies that $x^\star(\bar{w}_0,\gamma_2^\star(\bar{w}_0))$ is finite and thus $\gamma_2^\star(\bar{w}_0)\in(\pi(w_0),\bar{\gamma}(w_0))$. Thus, we have

$$f_1(\bar{w}_0,\gamma_2^\star(\bar{w}_0)) = \int_0^\infty (w(x;\bar{w}_0,\gamma)-\ell)^+\,\mathrm{d}x = 0 < L = f_1(\bar{w}_0,\gamma_1^\star(\bar{w}_0)), \tag{3.36}$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma 3.3 (c) and (3.35), the last equality follows from (3.19) and $\bar{w}_0<-k<\ell$. Recall that $f_1(w_0,\gamma)$ is strictly increasing in γ in Lemma 3.4, and thus (3.36) yields (3.33).

Next we prove (3.34). Suppose that it fails to hold, i.e., for all $w_0<\bar{w}_0$, we have $\gamma_2^\star(w_0)<\gamma_1^\star(w_0)$. Since $f_1(w_0,\gamma)$ is strictly increasing in γ, we have that for any $w_0\le\bar{w}_0$,

$$f_1(w_0,\gamma_2^\star(w_0)) < f_1(w_0,\gamma_1^\star(w_0)) = L. \tag{3.37}$$

If we can show that for any fixed $x > 0$,

$$\lim_{w_0 \to -\infty} w(x; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) = \infty. \tag{3.38}$$

then, fix any pair (x', x'') with $0 < x' < x''$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{w_0 \to -\infty} f_1(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \\
&= \lim_{w_0 \to -\infty} \int_0^\infty \big(w(x; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) - \ell\big)^+ \, \mathrm{d}x \\
&\geq \lim_{w_0 \to -\infty} \int_{x'}^{x''} \big(w(x; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) - \ell\big)^+ \, \mathrm{d}x \\
&\geq \lim_{w_0 \to -\infty} (x'' - x') \min\big\{(w(x''; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) - \ell)^+, (w(x'; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) - \ell)^+\big\} \\
&= \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality and the last equality follows from (3.38), and the second inequality follows from the properties of $w(x; w_0, \gamma)$ in $x \in [0, \infty)$ for all cases in Lemma 3.3. This contradicts with (3.37), and then we get (3.34).

It remains to prove (3.38). Fix $x > 0$. First, (3.24) implies that there exists a $\bar{w}_0^\dagger$ with $\bar{w}_0^\dagger < \bar{w}_0$ such that for all $y \in (0, x)$ and $w_0 \in (-\infty, \bar{w}_0^\dagger)$,

$$\gamma_2^\star(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y) \geq 0. \tag{3.39}$$

Choose any fixed $\hat{x}_1$ and $\hat{x}$ with $0 < \hat{x}_1 < \hat{x} < x$. Next we show that there exists a number $\hat{w}_0(\hat{x}, \hat{x}_1)$ with $\hat{w}_0(\hat{x}, \hat{x}_1) < \bar{w}_0^\dagger$, such that for all w_0 with $w_0 \leq \hat{w}_0(\hat{x}, \hat{x}_1)$, there exists a number $\tilde{x}$ with $0 < \tilde{x} \leq \hat{x}$ (here $\tilde{x}$ might depend on w_0) such that

$$w(\tilde{x}; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \geq 0. \tag{3.40}$$

Suppose that this does not hold. Then, there exists a w_0 with $w_0 \leq \hat{w}_0(\hat{x}, \hat{x}_1)$ such that $w(y; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) < 0$ for all $y \in (0, \hat{x}]$. Then, (3.2) implies that for all $y \in (0, \hat{x}]$,

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{2} w'(y; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) - M w(y; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \geq \gamma_2^\star(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y). \tag{3.41}$$

If $\hat{x}_1 \geq q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))$, then integrating (3.41) from $q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))$ to $\hat{x}$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
&w(\hat{x}; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \qquad (3.42)\\
&\geq -k e^{\xi(\hat{x} - q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)))} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_{q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))}^{\hat{x}} \big[\gamma_2^\star(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{\xi(\hat{x} - y)} \, \mathrm{d}y \\
&\geq -k e^{\xi(\hat{x} + K/(w_0 + k))} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_{q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))}^{\hat{x}} \big[\gamma_2^\star(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{\xi(\hat{x} - y)} \, \mathrm{d}y \\
&\geq -k e^{\xi(\hat{x} + K/(w_0 + k))} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_{\hat{x}_1}^{\hat{x}} \big[\gamma_2^\star(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{\xi(\hat{x} - y)} \, \mathrm{d}y,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\xi = 2M/\sigma^2$, the first inequality follows from $w(q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)); w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) = -k$, the second inequality follows from $-K/(w_0 + k) < q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \le \hat{x}_1$ (using $f_2(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \ge (w_0 + k)q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))$ and $f_2(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) = -K$), and the last inequality follows from (3.39).

If $\hat{x}_1 < q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} -K = f_2(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) &= \int_0^{q(w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0))} \big[w(y; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) + k\big] \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &\le \int_0^{\hat{x}_1} \big[w(y; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) + k\big] \, \mathrm{d}x \le \int_0^{\hat{x}_1} \big[w(\hat{x}_1; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) + k\big] \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &= \hat{x}_1 \big[w(\hat{x}_1; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) + k\big] \end{aligned}$$

and thus $w(\hat{x}_1; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \ge -K/\hat{x}_1 - k$. Integrating (3.41) from $\hat{x}_1$ to $\hat{x}$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned} &w(\hat{x}; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \\ &\ge w(\hat{x}_1; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) e^{\xi(\hat{x} - \hat{x}_1)} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_{\hat{x}_1}^{\hat{x}} \big[\gamma_2^\star(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{\xi(\hat{x} - y)} \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &\ge -\left(\frac{K}{\hat{x}_1} + k\right) e^{\xi(\hat{x} - \hat{x}_1)} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_{\hat{x}_1}^{\hat{x}} \big[\gamma_2^\star(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{\xi(\hat{x} - y)} \, \mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

Combining (3.42) and (3.43), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &w(\hat{x}; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \\ &\ge w(\hat{x}_1; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) e^{\xi(\hat{x} - \hat{x}_1)} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_{\hat{x}_1}^{\hat{x}} \big[\gamma_2^\star(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{\xi(\hat{x} - y)} \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &\ge \min\left(-k e^{\xi(\hat{x} + K/(w_0 + k))}, -\left(\frac{K}{\hat{x}_1} + k\right) e^{\xi(\hat{x} - \hat{x}_1)}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_{\hat{x}_1}^{\hat{x}} \big[\gamma_2^\star(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{\xi(\hat{x} - y)} \, \mathrm{d}y := f(w_0, \hat{x}, \hat{x}_1). \end{aligned} \tag{3.44}$$

Note that it follows from (3.24) that $f(w_0, \hat{x}, \hat{x}_1) \to \infty$ as $w_0 \to -\infty$. Hence, there exists a number $\hat{w}_0(\hat{x}, \hat{x}_1)$ with $\hat{w}_0(\hat{x}, \hat{x}_1) < \bar{w}_0^\dagger$, such that for all w_0 with $w_0 \le \hat{w}_0(\hat{x}, \hat{x}_1)$, we have $f(w_0, \hat{x}, \hat{x}_1) \ge 0$. Assumed that $w_0 \le \hat{w}_0(\hat{x}, \hat{x}_1)$, (3.44) implies that $w(\hat{x}; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \ge 0$, which contradicts with $w(y; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) < 0$ for all $y \in (0, \hat{x}]$. Hence, (3.40) holds. Furthermore, for any $w_0 \in (-\infty, \bar{w}_0^\dagger)$, (3.3) and (3.39) imply that once $w(y; w_0, \gamma^\star(w_0)) = 0$, we must have $w'(y; w_0, \gamma^\star(w_0)) > 0$. Thus, (3.40) and the continuity of $w(\cdot; w_0, \gamma^\star(w_0))$ imply that for any $y \ge \tilde{x}$,

$$w(y; w_0, \gamma^\star(w_0)) \ge 0.$$

Typically, it holds for all $y \in [\hat{x}, x]$ (note that here $\hat{x}$ and x do not depend on w_0). Together with (3.2), we have that for any $y \in [\hat{x}, x]$ and $w_0 \le \hat{w}_0(\hat{x}, \hat{x}_1)$,

$$1/2\sigma^2 w'(y; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) + M w(y; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \ge \gamma_2^\star(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y).$$

Then, for $w_0 \le \hat{w}_0(\hat{x}, \hat{x}_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & w(x; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) \\ & \quad \ge w(\hat{x}; w_0, \gamma_2^\star(w_0)) e^{-\xi(x-\hat{x})} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_{\hat{x}}^{x} \big[\gamma_2^\star(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{-\xi(x-y)} \, \mathrm{d}y \\ & \quad \ge \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_{\hat{x}}^{x} \big[\gamma_2^\star(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{-\xi(x-y)} \, \mathrm{d}y, \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (3.24), implies (3.38). Therefore, we finish the proof. □

4 Optimality of proposed policy

In this section, we prove our main result, Theorem 2.2, using the lower bound approach. First, in Section 4.1 we provide a lower bound for the cost under any admissible policy. Then, in Section 4.2 we show the cost under the proposed policy solved in last section can achieve the lower bound and thus the proposed policy is an optimal policy.

4.1 Lower bound

We give the lower bound for the cost under any admissible policy by the Itô formula as follows.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that there exists a constant γ and a function $f(\cdot) \in \mathscr{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$ with absolutely continuous and bounded derivative f' and continuous second derivative f'' at all but a finite number of points, satisfying*

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 f''(x) + \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{U}} (\mu f'(x) + c(\mu)) + h(x) \ge \gamma \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^+ \text{ at which } f'' \text{ exists} \tag{4.1}$$

with

$$f(x) \le f(y) + K + k(y - x) \quad \text{for } 0 \le x < y, \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$f(x) \le f(y) + L + \ell(x - y) \quad \text{for } 0 \le y < x, \tag{4.3}$$

Moreover, Suppose that f is bounded below, i.e., there exists a finite number f_{LB} such that

$$f(x) \ge f_{LB}, \text{ for all } x \ge 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Then $\mathcal{C}(x, \phi) \ge \gamma$ for any admissible policy $\phi = (\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{Y})$ and initial state $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

Proof. It follows from Itô's formula (see, e.g., Proposition 1 in [20]) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_t)] = \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_0)] + \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\int_0^t \Big(\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 f''(X_s) + \mu(X_s) f(X_s) \Big) \, \mathrm{d}s \Big] \\ + \sum_{i=1}^{2} \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\sum_{n=1}^{N_t^i} \big(f(X_{\tau_n^i}) - f(X_{\tau_n^i -}) \big) \Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Notice that (4.1) implies that $1/2\sigma^2 f''(x) + \mu(x)f'(x) + c(\mu(x)) + h(x) \geq \gamma$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\mu(x) \in \mathcal{U}$. Furthermore, (4.2) and (4.3) imply that for each $n \geq 0$, $f(X_{\tau_n^1}) - f(X_{\tau_n^1-}) \geq -(K + k\xi_n^1)$ and $f(X_{\tau_n^2}) - f(X_{\tau_n^2-}) \geq -(L + \ell\xi_n^2)$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_x[f(X_t)] \\
&\quad \geq \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_0)] + \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\int_0^t \big(\gamma - c(\mu_s) - h(X_s)\big)\,\mathrm{d}s\Big] - \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\sum_{n=1}^{N_t^1}\big(K + k\xi_n^1\big)\Big] \\
&\qquad - \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\sum_{n=1}^{N_t^2}\big(L + \ell\xi_n^2\big)\Big] \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_0)] + \gamma t - \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\int_0^t \big(h(X_s) + c(\mu_s)\big)\,\mathrm{d}s + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^1}\big(K + k\xi_n^1\big) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^2}\big(L + \ell\xi_n^2\big)\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides of the above inequality by t and letting $t \to \infty$ gives

$$\mathcal{C}(x, \phi) \geq \gamma + \limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_x[f(X_t)]}{t}. \tag{4.6}$$

It follows from (4.4) that $\limsup_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_t)]/t \geq 0$. Hence, (4.6) yields $\mathcal{C}(x, \phi) \geq \gamma$. □

4.2 Optimality of proposed policy

In this subsection, we first in Proposition 4.2 characterize the cost under any policy $\phi = \{(0, q, Q, S), \{\mu(x) \in \mathcal{U}, x \in [0, S]\}\}$, and then prove our Theorem 2.2 by showing that the cost under the proposed policy can achieve the lower bound in Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 4.2. *Consider a policy $\phi = \{(0, q, Q, S), \{\mu(x) \in \mathcal{U}, x \in [0, S]\}\}$ with $0 < q \leq Q < S$. Suppose that there exists a constant γ and a twice continuously differentiable function: $V : [0, S] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying*

$$1/2\sigma^2 V''(x) + \mu(x)V'(x) + c(\mu(x)) + h(x) = \gamma \quad \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq S, \tag{4.7}$$

with boundary conditions

$$V(0) = V(q) + K + kq, \tag{4.8}$$

$$V(S) = V(Q) + L + \ell(S - Q). \tag{4.9}$$

Then, the average cost $\mathcal{C}(x, \phi) = \gamma$ for any initial state $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

Proof. Notice that if the initial state $x \notin [0, S]$, there will be a one-time control to bring it to the closer of level q or Q and thus the state will stay in $[0, S]$ forever under the policy ϕ. Since the one-time finite control cost can be ignored in the long-run average cost, and thus it suffices to consider the case that the initial state $x \in [0, S]$.

Since V is twice continuously differentiable on $[0, S]$, it has bounded derivative on $[0, S]$. Furthermore, it follows from (4.8) and (4.9) that under policy ϕ, $V(X_{\tau_n^1}) - V(X_{\tau_n^1-}) = -(K + k\xi_n^1)$

and $V(X_{\tau_n^2}) - V(X_{\tau_n^2-}) = -(L + \ell\xi_n^2)$. Since $0 \le X_t \le S$ for all $t > 0$ under policy ϕ, it follows from (4.5) and (4.7) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_x[V(X_t)] &= \mathbb{E}_x[V(X_0)] + \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\int_0^t 1/2\sigma^2 V''(X_s) + \mu(X_s)V(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}s\Big] \qquad (4.10)\\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{2} \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\sum_{n=1}^{N_t^i}\Big(V(X_{\tau_n^i}) - V(X_{\tau_n^i-})\Big)\Big]\\
&= \mathbb{E}_x[V(X_0)] + \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\int_0^t (\gamma - c(\mu(X_s)) - h(X_s))\,\mathrm{d}s\Big]\\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\sum_{n=1}^{N_t^1}\big(K + k\xi_n^1\big)\Big] - \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\sum_{n=1}^{N_t^2}\big(L + \ell\xi_n^2\big)\Big]\\
&= \mathbb{E}_x[V(X_0)] + \gamma t\\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}_x\Big[\int_0^t \big(h(X_s) + c(\mu_s)\big)\,\mathrm{d}s + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^1}\big(K + k\xi_n^1\big) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^2}\big(L + \ell\xi_n^2\big)\Big]
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\min_{0\le x\le S} V(x) \le V(X_t) \le \max_{0\le x\le S} V(x)$, which implies

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_x[V(X_t)]/t = 0.$$

Dividing both sides of (4.10) by t and letting $t \to \infty$, we have $\mathcal{C}(x,\phi) = \gamma$. □

Remark 4.1. *V is called the relative value function in the literature, and (4.7) is called the Poisson equation, associated with the modified control band policy ϕ; see e.g., [11] and [20].*

We are ready to prove our Theorem 2.2. Recall the solution $w^\star$ and $\{q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star, \gamma^\star\}$ to (2.1)-(2.5) in Theorem 2.1, we define

$$f^\star(x) = \begin{cases} \int_0^x w^\star(y)\,\mathrm{d}y & \text{for } 0 \le x \le S^\star,\\ \int_0^{S^\star} w^\star(y)\,\mathrm{d}y + \ell(x - S^\star) & \text{for } x > S^\star. \end{cases}$$

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Since $\phi^\star = \{(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star), \{\mu^\star(x) \in \mathcal{U}, x \in [0, S^\star]\}\}$ satisfies (2.1)-(2.3) in Theorem 2.1 and (2.6)-(2.7), letting $V(x) = f^\star(x)$ in Proposition 4.2, we have that $\gamma^\star$ is the average cost under $\phi^\star$. If we can prove that $f^\star$ and $\gamma^\star$ satisfy the conditions in Proposition 4.1, then $\mathcal{C}(x,\phi) \ge \gamma^\star$ for any admissible policy $\phi \in \Pi$ and any initial state $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and thus $\gamma^\star$ is the optimal average cost and $\phi^\star$ is an optimal policy.

It remains to check the conditions in Proposition 4.1. First, it follows from (2.5) and the definition of $f^\star$ that $f^\star$ has an absolutely continuous and bounded derivative $\mathrm{d}f^\star(x)/\mathrm{d}x$. Moreover, it follows from (2.1) that $f^\star$ also has a continuous second derivative at all points in $\mathbb{R}^+$ except $S^\star$ maybe. Moreover, it follows from the definition of $f^\star$ and $\ell > 0$ that $f^\star(x) \ge \min_{0\le x\le S^\star} f(x)$ for all $x \ge 0$. Hence, (4.4) holds.

Next, we check (4.1). It follows from (2.1) and the definition of f that (4.1) holds for $x \in [0, S^\star]$.

For $x > S^\star$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}^2 f^\star(x)}{\mathrm{d}x^2} + \min_{\mu\in\mathcal{U}}\Big(\mu\frac{\mathrm{d}f^\star(x)}{\mathrm{d}x} + c(\mu)\Big) + h(x) &= \min_{\mu\in\mathcal{U}}\big(\mu\ell + c(\mu)\big) + h(x)\\ &\geq \min_{\mu\in\mathcal{U}}\big(\mu\ell + c(\mu)\big) + h(S^\star)\\ &= \gamma^\star,\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from $\mathrm{d}f^\star(x)/\mathrm{d}x = \ell$ and $\mathrm{d}^2 f^\star(x)/\mathrm{d}x^2 = 0$, the inequality follows from Assumption 1 and $x > S^\star$, and the last equality follows from (2.1) with $x = S^\star$ and (2.5).

We next check (4.2). For $0 \leq x < y$, the proof is divided into three cases: $x > S^\star$, $0 \leq x < y \leq S^\star$ or $0 \leq x \leq S^\star < y$. If $x > S^\star$, we have $f^\star(y) + K + k(y-x) - f^\star(x) = (\ell + k)(y-x) + K > 0$. If $0 \leq x < y \leq S^\star$, we have

$$f^\star(y) + K + k(y-x) - f^\star(x) = \int_x^y (w^\star(z) + k)\,\mathrm{d}z + K \geq \int_0^{q^\star} (w^\star(z) + k)\,\mathrm{d}z + K = 0, \quad (4.11)$$

where the inequality follows from $w^\star(x) \leq -k$ for $0 \leq x \leq q^\star$ and $w^\star(x) \geq -k$ for $q^\star \leq x \leq S^\star$ (see Theorem 2.1), and the last equality follows from (2.2). When $0 \leq x \leq S^\star < y$, we have

$$f^\star(y) + K + k(y-x) - f^\star(x) = f^\star(S^\star) + K + k(S^\star - x) - f^\star(x) + (\ell + k)(y - S^\star) \geq 0,$$

where the equality follows from $f^\star(y) = f^\star(S^\star) + \ell(y - S^\star)$, and the inequality follows from $f(S^\star) + K + k(S^\star - x) - f(x) \geq 0$ (using (4.11) when $y = S^\star$).

Finally, we check that (4.3) holds for all $0 \leq y < x$. The proof is also divided into three cases: $y > S^\star$, $0 \leq y < x \leq S^\star$ or $0 \leq y \leq S^\star < x$. If $y > S^\star$, we have $f(y) + L + \ell(x-y) - f(x) = L > 0$. If $0 \leq y < x \leq S^\star$, we have

$$f(y) + L + \ell(x-y) - f(x) = -\int_y^x (w(z) - \ell)\,\mathrm{d}z + L \geq -\int_{Q^\star}^{S^\star} (w^\star(z) - \ell)\,\mathrm{d}z + L = 0, \quad (4.12)$$

where the inequality is due to $w^\star(x) \leq \ell$ for $0 \leq x \leq Q^\star$ and $w^\star(x) \geq \ell$ for $Q^\star \leq x \leq S^\star$ (see Theorem 2.1), and the last equality follows from (2.3). If $0 \leq y \leq S^\star < x$, we have

$$f(y) + L + \ell(x-y) - f(x) = f(y) + L + \ell(S^\star - y) - f(S^\star) \geq 0,$$

where the inequality follows (4.12) with letting $x = S^\star$. □

5 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we consider a joint drift rate control and impulse control problem for a Brownian inventory/production system with the objective of minimizing the long-run average cost. We prove that an optimal policy has the $\{(0, q^\star, Q^\star, S^\star), \{\mu^\star(x) : x \in [0, S^\star]\}\}$ structure by using the lower bound approach. The existence of the optimal policy parameters is shown by solving a free boundary problem, which is crucial in this paper. We provide a roadmap to solve this free boundary problem, which we believe can be used in other control problems with more general processes.

There are several directions worthy of future research. First, we can discuss a compound Poisson demand process rather than a Brownian demand process. If the demand process is a compound Poisson process, the Poisson equation will no longer be a simple ODE, which will complicate the analysis. Second, we can also consider the problem of minimizing the discounted total cost rather than that of minimizing long-run average cost. Finally, we can take pricing decision into account, with the objective of maximizing the long-run average profit instead of average cost.

A Proof of Lemma 3.1

Proof. Since $\mu w + c(\mu)$ is linear in w for any fixed $\mu \in \mathcal{U}$, we know that $\pi(w)$ is concave in $w \in \mathbb{R}$, by noting that the concavity is preserved under minimization operator; see e.g., Section 3.2.3 in [6].

Let $w_1 < w_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\pi(w_2) - \pi(w_1)| &= |\min_{\mu\in\mathcal{U}}(\mu w_2 + c(\mu)) - \min_{\mu\in\mathcal{U}}(\mu w_1 + c(\mu))| \\
&\le \max_{\mu\in\mathcal{U}}|(\mu w_2 + c(\mu)) - (\mu w_1 + c(\mu))| \\
&= \max_{\mu\in\mathcal{U}}|\mu(w_2 - w_1)| \\
&= \max\{|\underline{\mu}|, |\bar{\mu}|\}(w_2 - w_1) = M(w_2 - w_1),
\end{aligned}$$

and thus $\pi(w)$ is Lipschitz continuous.

Denote $\mu_1 = \mu(w_1)$ and $\mu_2 = \mu(w_2)$. By the definition of $\mu(w)$, we have

$$\mu_1 w_1 + c(\mu_1) \le \mu_2 w_1 + c(\mu_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_2 w_2 + c(\mu_2) \le \mu_1 w_2 + c(\mu_1).$$

Summing them up, we have $(\mu_2 - \mu_1)(w_2 - w_1) \le 0$ and thus $\mu_2 \le \mu_1$ if $w_1 < w_2$. Hence, $\mu(w)$ is decreasing in w. □

B Auxiliary proof for Lemma 3.5

Proof. First, we prove that $f_2(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0))$ is strictly increasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty, -k)$. Let $w_0^\dagger$ and $w_0^\ddagger$ be two numbers satisfying $w_0^\dagger < w_0^\ddagger < -k$. If we can prove

$$q(w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger)) > q(w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger)) \quad \text{and} \tag{B.1}$$

$$w(x; w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger)) < w(x; w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger)) \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, q(w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger))], \tag{B.2}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger)) &= \int_0^{q(w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger))} \big[w(x; w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger)) + k\big]\, \mathrm{d}x \\ &< \int_0^{q(w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger))} \big[w(x; w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger)) + k\big]\, \mathrm{d}x \\ &< \int_0^{q(w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger))} \big[w(x; w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger)) + k\big]\, \mathrm{d}x \\ &= f_2(w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger)), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from (B.1) and $w(x; w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger))+k < 0$ for all $x \in [0, q(w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger))]$ (see (3.26)), and the second inequality follows from (B.2). Thus, we have got that $f_2(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0))$ is strictly increasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty, -k)$.

We next prove (B.1). Recall the definition of $x^\star(w_0, \gamma)$ in Lemma 3.3 (c) and (3.21) that

$$\max_{x \geq 0} w(x; w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = -k,$$

which, together with Lemma 3.2 (c) and (d), implies that

$$\gamma_2(w_0) \text{ is strictly decreasing in } w_0 \in (-\infty, -k). \tag{B.3}$$

Furthermore, it follows from (3.21) and (3.26) that

$$w(q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)); w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = w(x^\star(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)); w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = -k, \tag{B.4}$$

which together with the properties of w, yields that

$$q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = x^\star(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)).$$

Then,

$$w'(q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)); w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = w'(x^\star(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)); w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = 0.$$

Thus, taking $\gamma = \gamma_2(w_0)$ and $x = q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0))$ in (3.3), we have

$$\pi(-k) + h(q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = \gamma_2(w_0), \tag{B.5}$$

which, together with the monotonicity of $h(x)$ and $\gamma_2(w_0)$, implies (B.1).

We next prove (B.2). Lemma 3.3 (c) and (B.1) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} w(q(w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger)); w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger)) &< w(q(w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger)); w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger)) \\ &= -k \\ &= w(q(w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger)); w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger)) \end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

Define $f_3(x) = w(x; w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger)) - w(x; w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger))$, then

$$f_3(0) = w_0^\ddagger - w_0^\dagger > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f_3(q(w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger))) > 0,$$

where the inequality follows from (B.6). Suppose (B.2) doesn't hold, i.e. by the continuity of $f_3(\cdot)$, there exists a number $x_1^\dagger \in (0, q(w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger)))$ such that $f_3(x_1^\dagger) = 0$. It follows from (3.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} &w'(x_1^\dagger; w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger)) + \pi(w(x_1^\dagger; w_0^\dagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger))) + h(x_1^\dagger) = \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger) \quad \text{and} \\ &w'(x_1^\dagger; w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger)) + \pi(w(x_1^\dagger; w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger))) + h(x_1^\dagger) = \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger), \end{aligned}$$

which, together with $f_3(x_1^\dagger) = 0$, imply that

$$f_3'(x_1^\dagger) = \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger) - \gamma_2(w_0^\dagger) < 0, \tag{B.7}$$

where the inequality follows from (B.3). Hence, there exists an $x_2^\dagger \in (x_1^\dagger, q(w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger)))$ such that $f_3(x_2^\dagger) < 0$, which together with $f_3(q(w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger))) > 0$, implies that there must exist an $x_3^\dagger \in (x_2^\dagger, q(w_0^\ddagger, \gamma_2(w_0^\ddagger)))$ such that

$$f_3(x_3^\dagger) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f_3'(x_3^\dagger) > 0. \tag{B.8}$$

Furthermore, using $f_3(x_3^\dagger) = 0$, it is similar to (B.7) that we must have $f_3'(x_3^\dagger) < 0$, which contradicts with the second part of (B.8). Thus, we have got (B.2) and thus have finished the proof for that $f_2(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0))$ is strictly increasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty, -k)$.

Let $w_0 \to -k$, it follows from the definition of $q(w_0, \gamma)$, we have $q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) \to 0$ and thus $\lim_{w_0 \to -k} f_2(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = 0$.

We next prove the second part of (3.27). First, we show that

$$\lim_{w_0 \to -\infty} \gamma_2(w_0) = \infty. \tag{B.9}$$

If it fails to hold, then it follows from (B.3) that there exists a finite number $\bar{\gamma}_2^\ddagger$ such that $\gamma_2(w_0) \le \bar{\gamma}_2^\ddagger$ for all $w_0 < -k$. Hence, it follows from (B.5) and Assumption 1 that there exists a finite number $\bar{q}^\ddagger$ such that $q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) \le \bar{q}^\ddagger$ for all $w_0 < -k$. Therefore, we have that for all $w_0 < -k$,

$$w(x^\star(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)); w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = \max_{0 \le x \le \bar{q}^\ddagger} w(x; w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) \le \max_{0 \le x \le \bar{q}^\ddagger} w(x; w_0, \bar{\gamma}_2^\ddagger), \tag{B.10}$$

where the equality follows from $x^\star(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) \le \bar{q}^\ddagger$ (see (3.21) and (3.26)) and Lemma 3.3 (c), and the inequality follows from $\gamma_2(w_0) \le \bar{\gamma}_2^\ddagger$ and Lemma 3.2 (c). Hence, it follows from (B.4) that

$$\max_{0 \le x \le \bar{q}^\ddagger} w(x; w_0, \bar{\gamma}_2^\ddagger) \ge -k$$

for all $w_0 < -k$. However, it follows from Lemma 3.2 (d) that $w(x; w_0, \bar{\gamma}_2^\ddagger) \to -\infty$ as $w_0 \to \infty$ for any $x \in [0, \bar{q}^\ddagger]$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, (B.9) holds.

Using (B.5) and $\lim_{w_0 \to -\infty} \gamma_2(w_0) = \infty$, we have $\lim_{w_0 \to -\infty} q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = \infty$. If the second part of (3.27) doesn't hold, then the fact that $f_2(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0))$ is strictly increasing in $w_0 \in (-\infty, -k)$

implies that there exists a number $\underline{f}$ such that $f_2(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) \geq \underline{f}$ for all $w_0 < -k$. For any fixed pair $(x_4^\dagger, x_5^\dagger)$ with $0 < x_4^\dagger < x_5^\dagger$, $\lim_{w_0 \to -\infty} q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = \infty$ implies that there exist a $w_0^\sharp$ such that for any $w_0 < w_0^\sharp$,

$$q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) > x_5^\dagger > x_4^\dagger.$$

Then, it follows from Lemma 3.3 (c) that

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{f} \leq f_2(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) &= \int_0^{q(w_0,\gamma_2(w_0))} \big[w(x; w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) + k\big]\, \mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \int_0^{x_4^\dagger} \big[w(x_4^\dagger; w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) + k\big]\, \mathrm{d}x = x_4^\dagger \big[w(x_4^\dagger; w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) + k\big],\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $w(x_4^\dagger; w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) \geq \underline{f}/x_4^\dagger - k$. Furthermore, it follows from (3.2) and $w(q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)); w_0, \gamma_2(x_0))$ $-k < 0$ that for any $w_0 < w_0^\sharp$ and $x \in [0, q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0))]$,

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{2} w'(x; w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) - M w(x; w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) \geq \gamma_2(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(x),$$

which yields that for $w_0 < w_0^\sharp$,

$$\begin{aligned}&w(x_5^\dagger; w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) \\ &\quad \geq w(x_4^\dagger; w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) e^{\xi(x_5^\dagger - x_4^\dagger)} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_{x_4^\dagger}^{x_5^\dagger} \big[\gamma_2(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{\xi(x_5^\dagger - y)}\, \mathrm{d}y \\ &\quad \geq \Big(\frac{\underline{f}}{x_4^\dagger} - k\Big) e^{\xi(x_5^\dagger - x_4^\dagger)} + \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_{x_4^\dagger}^{x_5^\dagger} \big[\gamma_2(w_0) - \pi(0) - h(y)\big] e^{\xi(x_5^\dagger - y)}\, \mathrm{d}y,\end{aligned}$$

where $\xi = 2M/\sigma^2$. Therefore, (B.9) immediately implies

$$\lim_{w_0 \to -\infty} w(x_5^\dagger; w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) = \infty.$$

However, it follows from $q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) > x_5^\dagger$ and Lemma 3.3 (c) that $w(x_5^\dagger; w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)) \leq w(q(w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)); w_0, \gamma_2(w_0)$ $-k$. This contradiction implies that the second part of (3.27). □

Acknowledgments

We thank Professor Hanqin Zhang at National University of Singapore for the discussions about this problem.

References

[1] Adkins, William A., Mark G. Davidson. 2012. *Ordinary Differential Equations*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer.

[2] Ata, B., J. M. Harrison, L. A. Shepp. 2005. Drift rate control of a Brownian processing system. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **15**(2) 1145–1160.

[3] Avram, F., F. Karaesmen. 1996. A method for computing double band policies for switching between two diffusions. *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences* **10**(4) 569–590.

[4] Benkherouf, L., A. Bensoussan. 2009. Optimality of an (s, S) policy with compound Poisson and diffusion demands: a quasi-variational inequalities approach. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* **48**(2) 756–762.

[5] Bensoussan, A., R. H. Liu, S. P. Sethi. 2005. Optimality of an (s, S) policy with compound Poisson and diffusion demands: a quasi-variational inequalities approach. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* **44**(5) 1650–1676.

[6] Boyd, S., L. Vandenberghe. 2004. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[7] Chen, H., O. Q. Wu, D. Yao. 2010. On the benefit of inventory-based dynamic pricing strategies. *Production and Operations Management* **19**(3) 249–260.

[8] Chernoff, H., A. J. Petkau. 1978. Optimal control of a Brownian motion. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **34**(4) 717–731.

[9] Constantinides, G. M. 1976. Stochastic cash management with fixed and proportional transaction costs. *Management Science* **22**(12) 1320–1331.

[10] Constantinides, G. M., S. Richard. 1978. Existence of optimal simple policies for discounted-cost inventory and cash management in continous time. *Operations Research* **26**(4) 620–636.

[11] Dai, J. G., D. Yao. 2013. Brownian inventory models with convex holding cost, part 1: average-optimal controls. *Stochastic Systems* **3**(2) 442–499.

[12] Dai, J. G., D. Yao. 2013. Brownian inventory models with convex holding cost, part 2: discount-optimal controls. *Stochastic Systems* **3**(2) 500–573.

[13] Doshi, B. T. 1978. Two-mode control of Brownian motion with quadratic loss and switching costs. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **6**(3) 277–289.

[14] Feng, Haolin, Kumar Muthuraman. 2010. A computational method for stochastic impulse control problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **35**(4) 830–850.

[15] Ghosh, A. P., A. P. Weerasinghe. 2007. Optimal buffer size for a stochastic processing network in heavy traffic. *Queueing Systems* **55**(3) 147–159.

[16] Harrison, J. M., T. M. Sellke, M. I. Taksar. 1983. Impulse control of Brownian motion. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **8**(3) 454–466.

[17] Hsieh, Po-Fang, Yasutaka Sibuya. 1999. *Basic Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations*. Universitext, Springer.

[18] Li, Q., S. Zheng. 2006. Joint inventory replenishment and pricing control for systems with uncertain yield and demand. *Operations Research* **54**(4) 696–705.

[19] Øksendal, B. 2003. *Stochastic Differential Equations*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. 6th edition.

[20] Ormeci, M., J. G. Dai, J. Vande Vate. 2008. Impulse control of Brownian motion: the constrained average cost case. *Operations Research* **56**(3) 618–629.

[21] Ormeci, M., J. Vande Vate. 2011. Drift control with changeover costs. *Operations Research* **59**(2) 427–439.

[22] Ormeci, M., J. Vande Vate, H. Wang. 2015. Solving the drift control problem. *Stochastic Systems* **5**(2) 324–371.

[23] Rath, J. H. 1977. The optimal policy for a controlled Brownian motion process. *SIAM Journal of Applied Mathmatics* **32**(1) 115–125.

[24] Richard, Scott F. 1977. Optimal impulse control of a diffusion process with both fixed and proportional costs of control. *SIAM Journal of Control and Optimization* **15**(1) 79–91.

[25] S.Kumagai. 1980. An implicit function theorem: Comment. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* **31**(2) 285–288.

[26] Song, Q., G. G. Yin, C. Zhu. 2012. Optimal switching with constraints and utility maximization of an indivisible market. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* **50**(2) 629–651.

[27] Vath, V. L., H. Pham. 2007. Explicit solution to an optimal switching problem in the two-regime case. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* **46**(2) 395–426.

[28] Wu, J., X. Chao. 2014. Optimal control of a Brownian production/inventory system with average cost criterion. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **39**(1) 163–189.

[29] Yao, D. 2016. Joint pricing and inventory control for a stochastic inventory system with Brownian demand. Working paper.

[30] Zhang, H., Q. Zhang. 2012. An optimal inventory-price coordination policy. *Stochastic Process, Finance and Control, Advances in Statistics, Probability and Actuarial Science: Volume 1. Edited by S. N. Cohen, D. Madan, T. K. Siu and H. Yang* 571–585.